

Appl. No. 10/691,807

Reply to Final Office action of February 8, 2006

REMARKS

As noted in our previous response, the presently-claimed inventions generally relate to a new and unique system for processing calls arriving from multiple telephone sources within an automobile or other vehicle. Unlike other telephony systems, our invention provides the user with control over calls received from multiple sources (e.g. a cellular phone, an ONSTAR or similar satellite phone built into the vehicle, cellular phones carried by other passengers, and/or the like). Because none of the references cited by the Office Action disclose at least this aspect of our inventions, we hereby request reconsideration of the Final Office Action dated February 8, 2006 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

By this response, minor edits have been made to claim 1 and to claim 9 to improve the readability and understandability of the claim, and to emphasize the multi-source features of the claims. The newly-inserted language was at least implicit in the prior version of the claim, so we do not intend this amendment as narrowing or made for purposes relating to patentability in any way. As a result, we do not surrender any legal equivalents to which we would otherwise be entitled.

We now respectfully request reconsideration because the newly-cited reference plainly fails to disclose each and every element of our claimed inventions. In particular, the Richard reference newly cited against our independent claims is entirely devoid of any mention of "*a plurality of telephone sources*", as expressly recited in our claims. Even to the limited extent that the Richard reference does relate to telephone functionality, only a single telephone source is contemplated. As a result, the reference cannot anticipate this basic feature of our claims.

As an example, the Office Action references a "hold button" in the Richard reference that is allegedly described at paragraphs 0112 and 0113. Upon review of this language, however, it is apparent that the "hold button" merely relates to conventional "hold" features found on many ordinary phones; it does not in any way relate to placing calls from multiple telephone sources (e.g. different cellular phones, a satellite phone, or the like) into a common hold queue, as recited in the present claims.


Appl. No. 10/691,807

Reply to Final Office action of February 8, 2006


For the reasons given above, all claims pending in the application are believed allowable and such allowance is respectfully requested. If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or has not paid a sufficient fee for this Response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge to our Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Handwritten signature of Brett A. Carlson, dated 6/8/2006.

By:

Handwritten signature of Brett A. Carlson.

Brett A. Carlson, Reg. No. 39,928

Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz PC
Customer Number 29906